



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,168	03/05/2001	Daniel Brown	0544MH-40017	3597

7590 03/14/2005

Christopher W. Kennerly, Esq.  
Baker Botts L.L.P.  
2001 Ross Avenue  
Suite 600  
Dallas, TX 75201-2980

EXAMINER

ADAMS, JONATHAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2134

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/800,168

**Applicant(s)**

BROWN ET AL.

**Examiner**

Jonathan R Adams

**Art Unit**

2134

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-3, 7, and 9 have been amended.
2. Claims 4-5 have been canceled.
3. Claims 10-47 have been added.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., groups different from roles) are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2134

7. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 14-21, 27-36, and 42-48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glasser et al., US Patent No 5956715, (hereafter referred to as '715) in view of "Purveyor Administrator's Guide" (hereafter referred to as PAG)

8. As to claims 1, 2, 7, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 34:

'715 teaches a secure access system using access control lists defining groups on a computer network comprising:

- Plurality of assets within the computer system / network resources such as files and folders (Col 3, Line 5, '715)
- Plurality of members registered to use the computer system / Users of system 100 (Col 3, Line 48, '715)
- Plurality of roles defining user rights each member having at least one role / List of user groups (Col 5, Line 58, '715)
- Plurality of access control lists corresponding to assets each list defining at least one privilege for accessing the asset according to a member's role / Access control lists (Col 4, Line 62, '715)
- Access is allowed by a member to a requested asset within a domain when the member has a role corresponding to a privilege for that asset / list of user groups... collections of users all of whom are subject to the same access permissions with respect to a particular resource (Col 5, Line 58, '715)

9. '715 does not teach for the network to comprise the Internet which uses resources on many domains and both user and group permissions. PAG

Art Unit: 2134

teaches an access control system for use on Internet servers using access control lists (Page 3, Line 13, PAG) and restricting by domain (Page 1, Line 9, PAG) and restricting by user and group name (Page 2, Lines 3-12, PAG). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to group users by Internet domains, groups, and users, in the access control list as done in PAG in the invention of '715. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to group users by Internet domains, groups, and users, in the access control list as done in PAG in the invention of '715 because to do so provides greater control as to which users may be allowed to access server resources.

10. As to claim 2, 3, and 8:

Privileges for each asset include actions that can be performed on that asset / Access permissions can include permissions to read... write... delete files. (Col 4, Line 44, '715)

Access is allowed when a requested access by a member includes an action to be performed from the access control list / It is the inherent to access permissions that access be allowed\restricted based on the user's resource request

11. As to claim 6:

System includes at least 2 domains / It is inherent that the Internet comprises many domains

Art Unit: 2134

12. As to claim 9:

Prior to the user attempting to access any asset, authenticating the users identification and assigning at least one role to the user / at the outset, a user is assumed to be logged into system 100 from client 130 (Col 9, Line 61, '715), List of user groups (Col 5, Line 58, '715)

13. As to claim(s) 16:

Domain/Role member granted ownership over a particular access control list / Administration group (Page 2, Line 13, PAG)

14. As to claim(s) 19:

Claim 19 corresponds to claim 1 and further comprises:

Query criteria specifying one or more assets / Execute query to determine one or more assets satisfying the query criteria to which the particular member has read access / when users try to view restricted files, the server queries them to authenticate their identity with a password (Page 2, Paragraph 4, PAG)

15. As to claim(s) 20, 21:

Claims 20, 21 corresponds to claim 1 and further comprises:

Defining a new asset / It is inherent that the assets available to users must first be defined by an administrator

Art Unit: 2134

16. Claim 10-13, 22-26, 37-41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over '715 in view of PAG in further view of HomeDoor 2.0 User's Guide (hereafter referred to as HDUG).

As to claim(s) 10-12, 22:

17. '715 as modified above teaches a secure access system using access control lists defining users, groups, directory, and domain privileges on a computer network. '715 as modified above does not teach the use of a universal role defining user rights across a plurality of domains. HDUG teaches a virtual domain system where a plurality of domains may be stored in different directories of the same server. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the virtual domain system of HDUG with the invention of '715 as modified above. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use the virtual domain system of HDUG with the invention of '715 as modified above because HDUG provides a method to implement multiple domains on the same computer, thereby reducing hardware and overall cost.

18. As to claim(s) 13:

First domain owns a second domain such that the first domain can create and destroy the second domain / the administrator of both domains may choose to associate himself/herself with a primary domain and may choose to create and destroy domains as necessary

19. As to claim(s) 23-33:

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 23-33 correspond with claims 10-20

20. As to claim(s) 34-48

Claims 34-48 correspond with claims 7-20 and 22

### ***Conclusion***

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.

See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

22. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan R Adams whose telephone number



Art Unit: 2134

is (571)272-3832. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 10am to 6pm.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse, can be reached on (703) 308-4789. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)272-3838. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



GREGORY MORSE  
PATENT EXAMINER  
BIOLOGY CENTER 2100